

PARA TATTVA-NIRNAYA
OF
SRI VATSYA VARADARYA
(NADADUR AMMAAL)
SALUTATIONS TO SRI HAYAGRIVA
SALUTATIONS TO SRI RAMANUJA
(SANSKRIT VERSE)

By the great seer Sri Ramanuja, by Sri Yamunarya, the greatest among seers and also by many other Acharyas, it has been expounded in detail that Vishnu is the Supreme Reality (Para-tattva) with the help of accredited maxims and words of Manu and others, and also by means of elaborate Vedic Texts of clear import. That we give below in brief.

.....

Here, it is being established that NARAYANA is the Supreme Brahman (Para Brahman). In this case, the prima facie view is – ‘Rudra is the greatest Reality of all’. To explain, it is understood that only the cause of the Universe is the Supreme Reality as the following text says: “From whom all the beings (came into existence)”. When it is questioned, ‘which that cause is? the Chandogya Upanishad reveals that the cause of the Universe is denoted by the word ‘Sat’. And the relevant text is: “This (Universe) was at first, my dear, only Sat”. The cause of the Universe is referred to in the Vajasaneyaka Text by the word Brahman as follows: “Brahman indeed (this) was at first”. Here by the maxim of Sarvasakha-pratyaya that the Vedic Texts should be so interpreted that there is harmonious agreement in their teachings, it must be granted that all the passages dealing with the Cause of the Universe in the Vedas expound only one (entity) as the cause. The word ‘Sat’ is a generic term meaning ‘existent’

and it will denote any existent object, big or small. On the other hand, the word 'Brahman' meaning 'big' is a specific term. According to the principle that a generic term should be interpreted as to signify the same (as is) denoted by a specific term, the Universal Cause denoted by the generic term 'Sat' is particularised by the specific term 'Brahman' with the result that the cause is not only an 'existent' thing, but also 'big'. The rule is laid down in the Sutra of Purva Mimamsa: "The sheep on the basis of the letter of the Mantra: A Vedic injunction lays down that an animal should be offered in a sacrifice. The question arises the animal belonging to which species is to be offered. Another Mantra states that the flesh of the sheep is to be offered, and thus signifies the particular animal (sheep) as distinguished from the general (animal). Similarly, the cause denoted by the term Brahman (big), which is common to sentient and non-sentient things, is particularised in the Aitareya Upanishad by the word 'Atman' (Self) which is applicable exclusively to a sentient being only. Thus, the Universal Cause is not only Sat (existent) and Brahman (big), but also Atman (a sentient thing). The Aitareyaka text reads: - "This existed in the beginning as Atman alone". Again, the word 'Atman' is common to all sentient beings and there arises a desire to know which particular sentient being is referred to as the Universal Cause. The Svetasvara Upanishad declares: "When there was darkness (Tamas) everywhere, there was no such (division) as day or night. There was no Sat (existence or being) and no Asat (non-existence or non-being). And Siva alone existed. That is the Aksharam or changeless reality existing from time immemorial within the sphere of the Sun which is worthy of adoration. It is from it that during creation the knowledge (of beings) attains expansions". From this passage, it is clear that the particular entity (which is the cause of the Universe) is only Siva.

This view may be demolished thus. In the Mahopanishad, it is stated, "The One Narayana alone existed". Narayana is presented as the cause by this Mantra, and so He may be the specific deity.

This is not so, (we reply). For this sentence is only a re-statement and it cannot have the power to postulate a specific idea. That this is a re-statement can be seen from the use of the words 'ha vai' (meaning well-known). They imply that what is said here is something well-known. Such is the use in the Chandogya Upanishad in the following Mantras: "All these beings indeed are born out of Akasa". "All these beings enter indeed into the Prana alone, and (they emerge from Prana only." In these two Mantras, the words 'ha vai' (well-known) signify that the idea is well-known. Therefore, the Mantras are taken to be a re-statement of an idea known already. The word Narayana here is similar to Akasa and prana in the texts quoted. It must be taken as denoting Siva alone since there is no indicatory symbol of this text "only Siva" to signify a re-statement, and since there is, in addition, an indicatory symbol of its being accepted as valid by the use of the word 'alone' (eva). Therefore, it is (determined) that only Siva is the cause of the Universe.

From this, it naturally follows therefore, that the power of granting Salvation also rests with him. It is postulated in Vedic text like "From whom all these (being were born)" that he who bestows Salvation is the same deity Siva who is the Universal Cause.

Again, it is specifically stated in the Svetasvara Upanishad that Rudra is superior to Narayana and that he is the giver of Salvation. "I know this great Person of sunlike lustre who is beyond Tamas or (the Prakriti). Knowing Him alone, one transcends death; there is no other path for the attainment of final release. There is none else higher than Him and there is no one who is subtler or greater than Him. He remains like a tree (erect and steady) in the Highest Heaven, by that Person the whole of this Universe is filled completely. Therefore that Being which is higher than all others has no form and no imperfection. Those who know this (Being) they become immortal while others who do not know Him) attain only misery. He is possessed of the faces, heads and necks of all and He lives in the cavity (of the

hearts) of all beings. (That) Bhagavan (Lord) pervades all things; and therefore, Siva has permeated into all things". (Here) indeed the Mantras ending with "By the Person the whole of this Universe", speak of the Paramapurusha who is described in the Purusha Sukta. Then, by the Mantra "That which is higher than Him", some deity is mentioned as being superior to Him. It is he alone that bestows the Salvation and no one else is stated by the Mantra "Those who know this (Being) become immortal". Finally by saying "Therefore, Siva has permeated into all things". It is obvious that the identification of that Person is made as Siva.

Similar is the Mantra in the Dahara-vidya in the Chandogya Upanishad (VIII.1.1.): "In this city of Brahman (viz. the body of the worshipper), there is a small abode like the lotus (viz. the heart), inside (that abode) there is an infinitely small being which has to be sought after, that has, indeed, to be specially desired and known about". Here is the mention of a substance denoted by the term Akasa (ether) as residing in the middle of the lotus-like heart; and it is also stated that some Reality that resides within it should be sought after by the aspirants of Release. You are surprised that towards the end of the text in question, it is declared that he, who is referred to here by the word Akasa (ether), makes the differentiation of names and forms. The relevant Mantra there is: "Indeed the Akasa is a differentiator (or creator) of names and forms, and of what is between these (name and form), that is Brahmana" (8.14.1). In the Purusha Sukta, this differentiation of name and form is said to be done by Parama Purusha in the following Mantra: "The omniscient Lord, who creates all beings, gives them names and (by those forms and names) ever continues to be calling them. (Tait. Aran. 3.12.7).

Therefore, from this passage (in Chandogya) it appears that some substance, which is other than the Parama Purusha and which is within the Parama Purusha is to be the object of meditation by those who aspire for salvation.

In the Dahara Vidya in Taitriya, it is determined that Mahesvara is the particular deity who is the highest of all by the

following Mantra (X.7). "That small lotus (i.e. the heart) which is free from impurity, which is the home of the Supreme Being, which exists in the centre of the city (i.e. the body of the worshipper), even as it is the subtle Brahman which is infinite like space (Akasa), free from sorrow (sin) etc., that has to be meditated upon. That syllable (Svara), which is chanted at the beginning of the Veda and which is firmly established at the end of the Veda, is Pranava or aum. The origin (or Prakriti), of that Pranava is 'a' (the letter 'a'). He who is signified by that letter is Mahesvara".

Similar is the teaching in Brihadaranyaka: "That which is the Akasa (ether) inside the heart; in it He rests; He is the controller of all, He is Isana (Ruler) of all." (4.4.22). Here, as in Chandogya, Parama Purusha existing in the centre of the heart (of the worshipper) is referred to by the word 'Akasa' (ether) and Isana (i.e. Siva) is depicted as existing within him.

The Atharva-sikha reads: "It is the (ultimate) cause that should be meditated upon. Only Sambhu, who possesses the supreme power of all and who is the Lord of all, is fit to be meditated upon in the midst of Akasa (ether)." (3). Here, by the word 'dhyeya' (should be meditated upon) that deity which is to be worshipped as existing in the midst of the Akasa (ether) in the heart, is particularised by the words 'Sambhu' - a name of Siva. Again it concludes by referring to the same deity by the word 'Siva' thus: "Siva alone is to be meditated upon, avoiding all other things-Siva who is the giver of auspiciousness".

In the same way, there is a Mantra in the Taittiriya Upanishad which says: "Brahman is Truth, Knowledge and Infinite. He who knows that which is in the great Ether (Parama-Vyoma) in the cavity (i.e., the heart)". Here, the heart is referred to by the word 'guha' (cavity). It is stated that there is a 'parama-vyoma' (or Parama-akasa greater ether) which is inside the cave (i.e. the heart) and which is the seat of the Brahman. The word 'parama-vyoma' denotes Purushottama. 'Vyoma' ordinarily means Akasa (ether) and in order to distinguish the Purushottama from Vyoma (i.e. Akasa or ether) the word 'Parama' meaning 'great' is used.

So Vyoma qualified by the attribute parama denotes Purushottama. That substance which has its seat in the Purushottama and which is to be meditated upon by the worshipper is known to be Siva since only then, there will be agreement with the Several Vedic Texts already quoted. Thus, it is determined that Siva alone is postulated here as being superior to Narayana and he is to be meditated upon as existing inside him.

Likewise in the first Section of Atharva siras Upanishad by the Mantra - "The gods, indeed, repaired to the Heaven (Svarga-loka). Those gods then questioned Rudra: "who are you?" He said, "I alone at first existed, I exist (at present) and I shall also exist (in the future). (There is) nobody else excepting me" - Rudra, who is questioned by the gods expounds his lordship over all.

The second Section begins: "Then the gods with upraised arms extolled Rudra" and continues "He is the Lord who, indeed, is Rudra and who is also Brahman; obeisance indeed to him again and again; He is the Lord who, indeed, is Rudra and who is also Vishnu; obeisance indeed to him again and again. He is the Lord who, indeed, is Rudra and who is also Mahesvara; obeisance to him again and again." By these words of the gods, the lordship of Rudra over all (other gods) is very clearly expounded.

Again in the third and fourth Sections, his lordship is expressed by the mention of several names of Rudra which are exclusively his own and by means of their etymological interpretation, thus — "The one Rudra, He is the Isana (Ruler); He is the Lord Mahesvara; (the great Ruler) He is Mahadeva" (He is the great Deity).

Then, the fifth Section begins; "This is the story of Rudra. This god, pervading all directions, was born before; He alone is within the womb. He is that is born and that will be born; He stands with face turned inward and He is possessed of faces on all sides. Therefore, this must be meditated upon."

Then, it states in the following Mantra that the fruit of

Salvation can be obtained by the worship of Rudra who exists in the Centre of the heart; "He is of the size of the tip of a hair, He is in the Centre of the heart, the god who is the Universe, who is the fire and who is the greatest. For those firm-minded men who realise Him that exists in the Atma, for them alone, there is eternal peace, and not for others." Then beginning with the words "This is the Pasupata-vrata (the austerity that pertains to Pasupati i.e. Siva)", and proceeds to describe an auxiliary to the worship of Siva the austerity that pertains to Pasupati in the form of smearing the entire body with holy ashes in accompaniment to a Mantra. The relevant Mantra is: "Repeating the Mantra 'Agni etc; one should take the holy ashes and touch them. Thereby this Pasupata vratain (austerity pertaining to Pasupati) is conducive to the act of the Release of Pasu from Pasa (Beings from bondage).

It is well-known that Sri Rudra hymns and similar texts eulogise the greatness of Rudra. Therefore, it is established that the Lord Pasupati alone is known by all the upanishadic texts as the cause of the Universe and as the granter of salvation.

Therefore, it is settled thus from the direct testimony of the Vedas that Rudra is the Supreme Lord. Consequently, the words of human beings can be valid only in so far as they conform to them. So, the Itihasas (Epics), Puranas and Tantras (Mystic Treatises) that pertain to Siva attain the status of being the Upabrihmana (or Expository Treatises of the Veda) since they are in consonance with the latter. The other Puranas, on the other hand that pertain to Prajapati (i.e. (Brahma) and Vishnu are clearly against the teachings of the Vedas and so they are to be disregarded as being invalid. This conclusion is based on the following Sutra (Aphorism) of the Purva Mimamsa: "If there is inconsistency between the Veda and the Purana, the latter will have to be treated as unauthoritative, "This is stated by Manu also: "All those Smritis, which are against the Vedas and those that misinterpret them, are of no avail after death. For they are indeed associated with Tamas or ignorance" (12.65), and are not beneficial.

Therefore, it is established on the authority of hundreds of Vedic Texts along with their expository treatises that Siva stands supreme over all other deities. (is the Supreme Reality Para Tattva).

Here, rises up another disputant (with an objection): Hiranyagarbha (i.e. Brahma) alone is entitled to be accepted as greater than all.

They explain: the words 'Sat' (Existent), 'Brahma' (big) and Atma (Self) that found in the texts dealing with the cause are all generic terms and they stand in need of a Chetana (a sentient being) whom they can particularise. This is supplied by the following text:

"Hiranyagarbha existed at first. He came into existence before all beings. He alone was there as the one master of beings. "The word Hiranyagarbha in this passage describing the Universal cause particularises the generic terms occurring in similar passages elsewhere. Therefore, those terms also must be taken to signify Hiranyagarbha alone.

Similar is the trend in a Section (of the Taittiriya Upanishad) which begins with the words "In the boundless waters (viz. the Ocean), in the midst of the cause of the Universe and the grantor of Salvation by the following Mantras: "In whom all this becomes absorbed (at the time of deluge) and from whom (all this emerges at the time of creation" (2) "From whom did emerge Prakriti (the Source of the Universe" (4) "No one rules over Him, His fame indeed, is very great", "His form is incapable of being seen and no one can see Him with his eye. He can be conceived only by the mind endowed with devotion and resoluteness. They who meditate on Him become immortal." (10). The next Mantra "From the waters arose Hiranyagarbha" states that this passage should be taken as being one with the aforesaid beginning with the words "From the waters arose" and with the eight Riks (or Hymns) beginning with "Hiranyagarbha existed at first" This passage which quotes the eight Hymns shows clearly that the Person mentioned above as being the unique cause of the Universe, as

having no Lord over Him and as being the grantor of Salvation is only Hiranyagarbha (i.e. Brahma).

Here, it is objected: that the Section beginning with "From waters arose" has been quoted as being one with the passage mentioned above. But that section is determined to be devoted only to the treatment of Narayana because of the indicatory mark of His being the consort of Lakshmi which is stated by the Mantra - "Hrih (i.e. Bhumidevi) and Lakshmi are Thy consorts". "Not so" we say for the independent Scriptural Text is more powerful than the indicatory mark. The word 'Hiranyagarbha' in the Mantra "Hiranyagarbha existed at first" particularises the Person required without looking for any extraneous help. It is the decision of the Mimamsakas that the power of the Sruti (independent scriptural text) rests on one word whereas that of the Linga (i.e., indicatory mark) rests on a sentence (i.e. a group of words (and therefore Sruti is more powerful than the Linga). Again, a later mantra in the passage refers to the Universal cause by the word 'Dhata' (Creator) which is well-known as a synonym of Hiranyagarbha: (i.e. Brahma). "Dhata created the Sun and the Moon as before" is that Mantra. Several Vedic Texts like "Prajapati created the beings" teach that Prajapati alone is the cause of the Universe. Likewise, in the Dahara-vidya of the Chandogya Upanishad, Prajapati (i.e. Brahma) is revealed as the Deity that is attained by the Mukta (Released Soul) who says: - "I attain the Hall in the abode of Prajapati.

Again, another objection is raised: "There was nothing-existent or non-existent. Siva alone was there". "Sambhu is to be meditated upon in the midst of Akasa (ether)." "He who is supreme is Mahesvara." In the above passages, the words Siva and Mahesvara signify the deity who is particularised by the generic terms like 'Sat' (existent), 'Brahman' (big) and Atma (conscious self). True it was stated (so by the opponent); but it is a wrong statement, because Siva and other words also are generic terms and Hiranyagarbha is exclusively a particular term

that Signifies Brahma. To explain: it is seen that both in the word and in the Sruti the words 'siva' is used to signify several objects in the word associated with qualities like purity and auspiciousness. "May there be auspiciousness (Siva) for all the works": "May your paths be propitious (A happy journey to you);" "May this act be pure (Siva)"; "May you be pure and productive of happiness to us". He is the auspicious amongst things that are auspicious and inauspicious. "That essence of yours which is the purest." The word 'Sambhu' is often seen to be used in the sense of Druhina." (i.e. Brahma) in places like "Sambhu, the self-born, Druhina". The word Mahesvara is used with reference to kings and others in the sense of a 'great ruler' taking it as a compound word with the words in apposition (mahan isvarah).

In the Mantra "This Rudra alone is he that is Fire.....Taking the oblations with us, we approach Thee with obeisance," - the word Rudra is used to signify fire on account of the possession of some quality. On the other hand, the use of the word 'Hiranyagarbha' to denote any deity other than the four-faced Brahma has never been seen before. So, it is not, like the word 'Siva', a generic term (and cannot be taken as a common noun).

No doubt, the specific name of Narayana is found in the Text "There was indeed Narayana alone". But, since it refers to a fact as though it is well-known, it is only a re-statement of something already known. Therefore, it is not valid enough to import to us the knowledge of a particular deity (here Narayana). This has already been stated by us. (the Purva-pakshi). Therefore, it is proved that the Vedantas declare that Hiranyagarbha is the Supreme Brahman that is to be enquired into by those aspiring for Salvation.

The Puranas pertaining to the four-headed Brahma expound this idea. Other Puranas have got to be dismissed as invalid since that contradict the teachings of the Vedas. It is because of this that Bhagavan Manu mentions the Universal cause by the word 'Svayambhu' (Self-born) Manifest in the

following verse: "Then Svayambhu, the Lord." It is Well-known that the word 'Svayambhu' is synonymous with the four-faced Brahma. Therefore, the conclusion arrived at by the Vedas as well as their expository treatises is that the four-faced brahma alone is the Brahman.

Here, the final view is presented thus - Narayana is the Supreme Brahman; because in the passages delineating the cause of the Universe. He alone is declared as the Universal Cause; and also because it is stated in passages dealing with the topic of Salvation that He alone is the grantor of Salvation and the object of attainment by the Released Souls. To explain: In the passages dealing with the cause, generic terms like 'Sat', Brahman' and Atman' are found used to denote the cause and they look for a specific substance by signifying which they will be completed. They go up to and stop with Narayana, who is presented by the Mahopanished.

Note: The principle of interpretation here referred to is this; when in a certain context, a number of words of which the earlier are generic and the latter specific are employed to denote a thing, the generic words refer only to the thing denoted by the words which are specific. Here, 'Sat' (Existent) is an extremely comprehensive word referring to all that exists, both small and great, sentient and non-sentient, next comes 'Brahman' which excludes small things and applies only to the great (brihat). More specific is the word 'Atman' (Soul) which excludes non-sentient things and applies only to the conscious self. The word 'Narayana' is the most specific of all words, more specific than atman (the conscious self which includes the individual self as well.) Therefore, Sat, Brahman and Atma refer only to Narayana - who is Sat (Existent), who is Brahman (great) and who is also Atma (conscious self).

The Mahopanishad open thus : "Indeed Narayana alone then was, and not Brahma, no Isana, nor day, or fire, nor moon nor the ether and earth, nor the stars, not the waters, nor the sun; being all alone, He did not feel happy. Out of Him who was at the height of meditation, mind and ten senses (came out)." Then, it continues: "Then again that Narayana contemplated in His mind upon another will; from out of His forehead who was at the height of meditation perspiration fell down; out of the perspiration a

bubble came out; from that bubble a three-eyed and spear-armed Person was born.”

Here is a *prima facie* view: - It was said that this sentence is only a re-statement. True, it was stated; but we say the statement is not correct, the reason being firstly that it is the nature of the Scriptures to impart a knowledge of something which cannot be had from other sources and secondly that attainment of the fact of Narayana being the Universal Cause cannot be obtained by any other testimony.

It should not be stated that just because the structure of a sentence appears to a statement of something well-known, the sentence “All these beings indeed” should be taken as a restatement. In that case, there will arise the contingency that the following sentences also are restatements; for example - “A sacrifice which has fire as its presiding deity and in which ghee is offered in eight pans”, “Above indeed, for the gods he holds up.”

It cannot be contended that in those places also, there is only a restatement since that have been established as injunctions by the two Aphorisms (Sutras) of Karma-kanda i.e. Purva mimamsa, viz., “The passages are direct injunctions since they lay down something not known before (by another testimony).” “In the matter of holding it above, it is a direct injunction since it is something new (i.e. not known from other sources). But in the case of Texts like “All these beings, indeed, are (born out of the Akasa)”, Akasa (ether) and the like are known from other means of knowledge to be effects (Karya) and things that are to be shunned and therefore they cannot be delineated as being the ultimate cause and as being the object of highest attainment and also as being the repository of auspicious qualities which will be conducive to make them the cause of object of attainment. Again, there is another reason also. At the outset, there is a question viz, ‘what is the goal of the world?’ That shows that there is something superior which is going to be predicated. But, by the two Aphorisms (Sutras) “That which is denoted by the word ‘Akasa’ (is the Brahman), because His peculiar characteristics (are

mentioned in the context in relation to what is denoted by the word)" (1-1-23) and "For that same reason (which has been in the case of Akasa).

He who is denoted by the word Prana (also in the context is the Brahman)." It has been stated that there is a re-statement. Suppose, there is some other means of knowing the idea of a sentence which is in the form of a re-statement; that idea is strengthened it is mentioned as if it were well-known. Having this in mind, it was stated (by Sri Ramanuja in Sri Bhashya) that the mention of a thing as if it were well-known is the cause by which it is concluded that a sentence is a re-statement. In the Mantra, "The one Narayana alone existed" it does not appear that something else is going to be predicated; but on the contrary, it appears that the fact of Narayana who is the ultimate cause is predicated, because it is stated there that the entire Universe consisting of Brahma, Rudra and others excepting Narayana gets merged in him and that they also were born out of Him.

Another reason is, there is no testimony which proves that Narayana is a created being (an effect); if there were one, then describing Him as the ultimate cause would be inconsistent as in the case with Akasa (other). In regard to the Text, "Brahma, Vishnu, Rudra and Indra-all of them are generated, "it will be explained later that it does not speak of Vishnu as being an effect (or one of the created beings). Since this sentence - "The one, Narayana was at the beginning" - is not a re-statement (of something known already), and since the word Narayana occurring in it is specific name, the significance of Sat and other words, which are generic, extends up to that word 'Narayana'. Or let us grant that this sentence is a re-statement. Even then it must be taken as re-stating the fact of Narayana being the cause which is propounded by many other Srutis (Vedas) which do not have in them indicatory symbols to suggest that they are re-statement and which are of identical nature. Therefore, this sentence must not be taken as re-stating something which goes against all of them.

In fact, there are many Upanishadic Texts which proclaim

that Narayana alone is the cause. At first, in Subalopanishad, this is the mantra: “They said, “what was there then (i.e. before creation)? (i). “Nothing was here in beginning. These beings that are not the support (of others) are born having no (other) source. The one god is Narayana dwelling in the divine world.” (b)

Purusha Sukta states: “Out of Him was born the Virat (Cosmos); from that cosmos (was born the Purusha (i.e. Brahma). “In Narayana Anuvaka, Kathavalli and others, the qualities of conferring Salvation and of being the object of attainment by the Released Souls are predicated only with regard to Narayana and therefore it is stated by implication that the quality also of being the cause of the universe pertains to Him only. “From whom all these beings are born (3-1-1); “Non-existence (Asat), indeed, existence (Sat) was born. It transmitted Itself by Itself. Therefore, it is called ‘Sukritam’ (well-made). Therefore, whatever is there which is well done. Rasa (Bliss) indeed is He. Having obtained this very Bliss, he (the Jiva), becomes possessed of Bliss (Ananda). (2-7-1).

In these texts, it is postulated that the substance which is the cause of the Universe is also the bestower of Moksha (Release) and the goal of attainment for the Released Soul (Mukta). Therefore, even if the Upanishadic Texts here should be in the form of a re-statement, there is no contingency of a re-statement in regard to some other deity as being the cause. (It has been already explained that even if the passage should be in the form of a statement of something well-known, it cannot be classified as a re-statement since something new is predicated here.

Again, other Vedic Texts of this type are seen. Narayanopanishad reads: “Then, the Purusha, indeed, who is Narayana desired, ‘May I create the beings’... .. Out of Narayana, Brahma is born, Out of Narayana, Rudra is born; Out of Narayana, Indra is born, out of Narayana, the Prajapatis (or creators) are born. Out of Narayana, the twelve Adityas (or

Suns) Rudras and Vasus (are born); all the Vedas proceed out of Narayana; They spread from Him and again become dissolved into Him.”

Mahopanishad being - “Hari, the god, who is the controller of all and who is the supporter of all” and proceeds - “Out of whose lotus - like navel was born, the high souled Prajapati (i.e. Brahma), who is the creator of the universe and who is also of universal form knowing Him alone one gets over death; and there is no other way for the attainment (of the Lord).”

Therefore, it is determined that in the Texts dealing with the cause, Narayana alone is postulated as the ultimate cause (of all).

In the Text “Neither existent was there, nor non-existent, Siva alone was there, “the word ‘Siva’ also used with reference to the cause signifies only Narayana even as words like Sat (existent), Brahma (big) and Atma (conscious self) so, for as in the manner explained, Narayana is the subject of treatment in the passages dealing with the cause. Further, the word ‘Siva’ also is seen to be used to refer to Narayana the ultimate object of knowledge. “It has already been shown that this word (Siva) is used both in the Veda and in the words in several senses besides Rudra, whereas in the case of the word ‘Narayana’, nowhere is it seen to be used to indicate any (god) other than Narayana. Since the word ‘Siva’ is a generic term and it is inconclusive and tentative; since the word Narayana is not like that (i.e. it is the most determined of the designations); since there are many Upanishads which propound that Narayana is the cause, since there is only one passage that describes the cause and that is associated with the word Siva; since the word Narayana alone is repeated several times in one Upanishad, i.e. Narayana Anuvaka; since such is not the case in regard to the word Siva; since it is not reasonable to designate Siva as the Supreme cause when it is wellknown from many Vedic Texts that He is an effect (created being) - Vedic Texts like the following, the main purpose of which is to impart knowledge of this fact: “Neither Brahma (was there),

nor Isana (Siva)”: “Out of the bubble the three-eyed and spear-armed Person (i.e. Siva) was born”. “Out of Narayana, Rudra was born:” “Out of the Avyakta was born Sthanu (i.e. Siva), Mahesa”; in the Rigveda “From whom was born this Ugra (i.e. Siva)”; and also since Narayana is nowhere declared as being generated, Narayana alone is fit to be stated to be the Supreme cause in all those passages dealing with the cause.

Moreover, from the Bahvricha (Rigveda) Text it appears that greatness was attained by Siva by the propitiation of Bhagavan (i.e. Vishnu). The text says —“All gods are like the branches (limbs) of Vishnu who is the grantor of all desires and who is to be attained by means of food in the form of oblations (in sacrifice). Rudra attained (from Him) the greatness pertaining to Him.”

Therefore, it is faultless to declare that Narayana alone is the cause and not Rudra.

But, it was contended that Hiranyagarbha (Brahma) appears to be the cause from the Vedic Text “Hiranyagarbha existed in the beginning.” That is not correct. For it is impossible for him to be the cause since it is known from an authoritative testimony that he, like the Akasa (ether) and others, is an effect (a created being). Many are the Upanishadic Texts that declare him to be a created being. In Svetasvatara Upanishad – “He who creates (the four faced) Brahma first; and then communicates the Vedas unto him. “In other Vedic passages again – “Then the four faced Brahma was born. “In the Yajur Veda – “That one Prajapati (i.e. Brahma) was born on the lotus-petal. There are other texts also like the following – “Brahma indeed, created Brahma on the lotus-petal . “The Purusha (i.e. Brahma) was born out of the Virat (cosmos)”.

Therefore the word “Hiranyagarbha” used in regard to the cause (of the Universe) signifies, either by etymological interpretation or by the rule of extended signification, only Narayana even as the Akasa (Earth) and other words too.

Moreover, in the section beginning with the words. “In the boundless ocean” there are the following Mantras: “Poets

eulogise Him as being in the Ocean; “All substances subjected to the control of Time (like seconds etc.,) were born out of the Purusha possessed of effulgence of lightning.” “These declare the Purusha to be the Universal cause Purusha, who is determined to be Narayana by means of indicatory symbols like being possessed of the lustre of lightning, lying in the ocean and being the Purusha. It further states by the following Mantra that He is without a ruler over him and that He is the grantor of Salvation— “No one rules over Him; He indeed is greatly famous Those who meditate on Him became immortal.” Then the Mantra —“Out of the waters was born; The eight hymns beginning with Hiranyagarbha – states that the eight hymns beginning with “Hiranyagarbha was in the beginning “ should be taken as being one with the above-mentioned passage. Thereby, it teaches that the word Hiranyagarbha here signifies Narayana.

Moreover, since the passage “Hiranyagarbha” is understood to be one (and in agreement) with the passage “Out of waters was born”, since it has the indicatory symbol of Narayana being the Consort of Sri Devi by the presence there of the Mantra, “Hrih (i.e. Bhumi) and Lakshmi are Thy Consorts”, and since it is in the context of the Purusha Sukta, it is determined that the passage has Narayana as the subject of treatment. Therefore, the word ‘Hiranyagarbha’ cannot be taken as signifying the four-faced Brahma who is a created being. For all the reasons stated above, the word Hiranyagarbha that occurs here should not be taken as a proper name referring to Brahma, despite its coming under the category of ‘Sruti’ or the exegetical rule of self-sufficient Scriptural text (but must be given the proper meaning by splitting the compound and interpreting it). It is indeed well-known that Sruti (self-sufficient Scriptural Text) derives its strength from one word. If the primary meaning of the word is inappropriate and against the context, a secondary meaning should be given and the sentence interpreted, as is done in the case of the sentence ‘drench with fire’ (where one of the words has to be given a secondary meaning so that it may give sense (since

drenching cannot be done by the fire which has only the quality of burning).

Here an objection is raised: what is the authority for saying that the Purusha Sukta deals with Narayana alone? In the Narayana Anuvaka, Narayana is spoken of as the god with a thousand heads, as having the power to see all things and as being the Purusha. All these qualities are predicated in regard to the Purusha, in the Purusha Sukta. So, the Purusha is recognised as Narayana and it can aptly be said that the Purusha of the Purusha Sukta is the same as Narayana of Narayana Anuvaka. In the Subalopanishad beginning with the words "The eye is Narayana and the object to be seen also is Narayana", it is stated that Narayana is the Soul of all things and the conclusion is made by using the word 'Purusha' as follows "Purusha alone all this is". From this, it is known that the Purusha Sukta deals with Narayana. In the Atharvana Veda in a context where eighteen great Purificatory Rites (Maha Santi) are enumerated, each one of the Rites is associated with a particular deity and the particular Mantra (Hymn) that is presided over by that deity and that is to be used with reference to the respective deity is also prescribed. There is the injunction – "Purusha-Sukta (is to be recited) in the Purificatory rite presided over by Vishnu". Since it is enjoined there that the Purusha Sukta is to be used in regard to the Purificatory Rite pertaining to Vishnu, it is understood that the subject of treatment of Purusha Sukta is Vishnu (i.e. Narayana). The Uttara Anuvaka which has been established as being one with the Purusha Sukta states that Narayana is the consort of Lakshmi and by the indicatory symbol of being the consort of Lakshmi, the Purusha and Narayana are identical and the conclusion is arrived at that the Purusha Sukta which deals with the Purusha deals with Narayana. The authors of the Kalpa Sutras also point out that the Purusha Sukta treats of Narayana as stated below:

"The passage "The Purusha who has a hundred heads" which is associated with the Purusha who is Narayana," "Then

the worship by the two Narayana”, With the Uttra Narayana (passage) he worships the Sun”. That the Purusha Sukta is associated with Narayana is determined by the following Smriti Saka Text – (Sri Bhashya) – “The Hymn of the Purusha, who is Hari, confers Svarga (Heaven), bestows wealth and also gives reputation”. By the same principle stated above, the word ‘Dhata’ in the Mantra “Dhata created as before” refers to one who is ultimate cause and so should be taken as referring to Narayana. If it is interpreted that the creation here refers to Secondary creation and the word Dhata to the four-faced Brahma, who is the cause of that secondary creation, then there is no inconsistency. The same is the case with reference to the word Prajapati in the Text “Prajapati (the Lord of beings) created the beings” (i.e. word Prajapati signifies Narayana).

But, it was stated (in the prima facie view) that the four-faced Brahma has been described as the goal of attainment for the Mukta (or Released Souls) in the Mantra “I attain the Hall in the abode of Prajapati (i.e. Brahma)”. We say it is not correct, since in the Narayana Anuvaka. Kathavalli and others Narayana alone is revealed as the god of attainment for the Mukta (Released Soul). Moreover, this sentence occurs at the end of the passage dealing with the Dahara Vidya (one of the means for Salvation). It is going to be established by us that Narayana is the subject matter of that Vidya. Therefore, it is quite appropriate to hold that this sentence also has reference to Narayana only. Again, it is well-known that the word ‘Prajapati’ is not exclusively the name of Brahma and is used to denote Daksha and others who are created by the four-faced Brahma. Then, the word is treated as a compound-word which is split for purposes of interpretation. On the other hand, it is proper to take it as having reference to the word Narayana who is denoted by the Mantra “He who is the Lord of the Universe and who is Himself the Lord over Him”. This has been stated by the Sutrakara (i.e. Badarayana) in the following (Brahma Sutra) – “There is also no intention (on the part of the worshipper) to attain the effect (i.e. the four-faced

Brahma)” (4-3-13).

In the verse “Then the Self-born Lord” (Svayambhuh Bhagavan), the word ‘Self-born’ also signifies only Narayana for two reasons; firstly as in the manner stated above, it has been determined that Narayana alone is the ultimate cause; and secondly that word (Svayambhuh) is in Grammatical apposition with the word ‘Lord’ (Bhagavan) which exclusively denotes Vasudeva (i.e. Narayana). Narayana alone is the Supreme cause, and not Brahma and others, for this reason also that Narayana is referred to as the creator and Brahma as the created being in Texts like the following: “Therefore He is known as Narayana.

“That person who was created by Him (i.e. Narayana) is known in the world by the name of Brahma” (Manu Smriti 1-11).

Further, beginning with the words “He is the God with a thousand heads; He sees all things; He is the source of the happiness of the Universe”, and ending with – “He is Brahma, He is Siva, He is Indra, He is Akshara (The Freed Soul) the Supreme, and the absolutely Independent being. “The Narayana Anuvaka explicitly states in so many words without the necessity for the application of any exegetic rule that words of generic import like Siva, Indra and Akshara employed in all the branches of the Vedas to denote the Supreme Reality (Para Tattva) signify only Narayana. It also shows that Brahma and Rudra, in regard to whom there is a doubt if they are the Supreme Reality, are in the same category as Indra and others. Being a part of Narayana’s only means that they are subordinate to Him.

This section has for its purpose the particular determination of the object of worship associated with all the meditations (Vidyas) prescribed by all the Vedantas (i.e. Upanishads). It does not deal with the injunctions in regard to meditations; nor is it concerned with the particular determination of the object of meditation unlike in the Dahara Vidya alone which has been introduced earlier as the topic. This fact has been determined in the Adhikarana (section) (in the Brahma Sutras) having the Sutra – “Because, there is an abundance of indicatory marks (the

Narayana Anuvaka deals with the object of worship in all the Vidyas (3-3-43).

It cannot however be doubted that in the two sentences “Narayana is the Supreme Brahman” (Narayana param Brahma) and “Narayana is the Supreme Lustre” (Narayana paro Jyotih), ‘Narayana param’ and ‘Narayana paro’ are compound words in the Ablative case (Fifth case). In that case, the meanings will be ‘Brahman that is superior to Narayana and ‘Lustre that is superior to Narayana’ respectively. For that section beginning with the words “Narayana, who is Hari and who is also the Universe” goes on “Narayana is the Supreme Reality of Truth”, (whatever thing there is in this world, either seen or heard) .Narayana pervades all that within and without and so remains”, He is Brahma, He is Siva, He is Indra”. (By these Mantras), it is determined that Narayana alone is superior to all and therefore it is not possible to speak of some one other than Him as being Supreme. So, the sentences here are to be taken as being in the Nominative case, the Nominative termination of which has been dropped. Such usages are common in the Vedic literature as laid down in the Sutra”. In words the case – termination of singular number may be found used in the place of the plural or the case – termination itself may be dropped”. Mahopanishad dispelling this doubt, gives these words along with the respective case terminations thus – “Narayanah param Brahma, Tattvam Narayanah parah, Narayanah paro Jyotih Atma Narayanah parah” (Narayana is the Supreme Brahman, Narayana is the Supreme Reality; Narayana is the Supreme Lustre, Narayana is the Supreme Atma). Even granting that they are compound words, it will be appropriate to take them as compounds in grammatical apposition rather than as ablative compounds on the authority of the principle or maxim of Nishada – sthapati (the hunter-lord).

[**Note:** “A sacrifice should be performed with the Nishada-sthapati (the hunter-lord) as the master of the sacrifice”, is the Vedic injunction. Here, a doubt arises if the word Nishada-sthapati is to be taken as a genetive compound meaning “The

Lord of the hunters” or as an appositional compound meaning ‘the Lord who is also a hunter’; The Mimamsakas, after discussion, have determined that wherever possible compound words should be regarded as appositional as the full force of the component terms is only then brought about. Therefore, the meaning of Nishada-Sthapati is ‘a lord who is also a hunter’. Similarly, here ‘Narayana param’ means Narayana who is Supreme.]

Therefore, it must be understood that in this Anuvaka (Section) the mode of treatment is this that entity which is well-known in the Vedantas (i.e. Upanishads) as being the object of worship for Seekers after Release, as being the cause of the Universe, and as being the Inner Soul of the Universe and which is mentioned there by generic terms like Para Brahman (very big) and the like, is repeated here by the same words which bring to mind those passages and it is laid down that, that Entity is Narayana. This is in line with the conclusion arrived at (in Purva Mimamsa) in regard to the Mantra “He offers the oblation (in the fire) with a spoon (juhu). Here, the injunction is that a spoon (juhu) is to be used as an instrument for throwing the oblation into fire. The succeeding mantra reads – “He for whom the juhu (spoon) is made up of leaves”. This sentence which repeats the word ‘Juhu’ (spoon) reminds us of the previous Mantra where it has occurred and lays down the injunction that the Juhu should be made up of leaves only.

In the Maitreyopanishad is the Mantra – “That lustre of the Savita (i.e. creator), Vishnu by name, which is the most sublime, firm, motionless, immortal and which is the supporter of all. “In this Mantra, the Supreme Brahman which is well-known in all the Upanishads as being endowed with the qualities or firmness, deathlessness, motionlessness and as being the supporter of all that Brahman is particularise as having the name of Para Brahman (Vishnu). This idea is made clear in the Kathavalli beginning with the Mantra – “Whose essential nature all the Vedas reveal. That essential nature shall I tell you brief”, and ending with “He (the worshipper) attains that sublime essential nature of Vishnu which

is beyond the path of Samsara (i.e. material world)". Here it is declared in so many words that Substance which is revealed as the highest goal of attainment by all the Upanishads is the Svarupa (i.e. essential nature) of Vishnu. There are several hundreds of such Upanishadic Texts, but they are not quoted here for fear of being superfluous or over-elaborate. Therefore, (it is conclusively proved) that Narayana is the Supreme Brahman.

But (in the *prima facie* view) it was said — in the Mantra of Svetasvatara Upanishad "That which is greater than Him", it is declared that Rudra is greater than Narayana and that He alone is the grantor of Salvation. It is not correct (we say since it goes against the trend of the beginning of this section. For, at the beginning of the Mantra "(I) know that Maha Purusha (great person)" speaks of great Person. The next Mantra is – "By knowing (realising) Him alone one crosses (the Sea of) Death. There is no other way for attaining Him", Here two propositions are stated: (1) That realising the Maha Purusha (great Person) is the only way to Salvation and (2) that there is no other way. Then in order to substantiate them, it has been set forth that He alone is superior to all and no one else by the Mantra "Greater than whom no one else is". The prose order here is "Anything other than whom greater is not", That is to say that there is no contingency of any one being equal to or superior to Him. Otherwise, the conclusion will not be in agreement with propositions set forth at the outset. So, says a Vedic Text – "His equal is not seen, nor His superior". Therefore, it will be inconsistent if the Mantra "Than Him who is greater" is so interpreted as to declare that one deity other than Him (i.e. Narayana) is greater than all.

It has been established in Upakaramadhikarana (in Purva Mimamsa) that the beginning of a section is stronger than the conclusion. To explain – There is a Mantra – "With the Rik it is done in a high pitch; with the Yajus in a low pitch; and in a high pitch with Sama" (Veda). Here, the doubt arises whether the terms high pitch etc. are the qualities of the Rik-mantras (i.e. Hymns in verse form) and so on or they are qualities of those

Vedas where such Hymns (in prose or verse) mostly occur. The *prima facie* view is that the terms should be taken as referring to the qualities of the Mantra since the well-known meaning of the Rik and other words is only Mantra. (i.e. Rik means verse, Yajur means prose and Sama means song). The word 'Veda' occurring at the beginning should be interpreted etymologically and should be taken to signify 'what is shown to be performed'. (The word 'Veda' is derived from the verb *Vedayati* which means 'shows'). Instead of that if the Text and the terms Rik, Yajur and Sama are taken as referring to the qualities of the three Vedas, (i.e. Rik, Yajur and Sama), then it will mean that Rik and other words are given only a secondary sense (instead of the primary meaning). Therefore, the terms high pitch etc. denote only the qualities of the Mantra.

Against this *prima facie* view, the final view as states – it is proper to take the terms high pitch and the like referring to the qualities of the Vedas which comprise the whole unit of Mantra (Hymns) and Brahmana (Explanatory passages). Only then it will be in agreement with the beginning of the passage under discussion. The opening part or beginning is really stronger than the conclusion which comes later; because, when it occurs, there is nothing against it at that time. When a statement is made for the first time (i.e. at the beginning), it is valid since there is nothing contrary to it which will make it ineffective. Therefore, it is considered stronger than the conclusion which comes only later (against which there is already something i.e. the beginning). Here is an illustration which will justify it from the touch of fire which takes place first we have the factual knowledge that fire is hot. That perceptual knowledge is stronger than the inferential knowledge which says 'fire is not hot' because it is a substance, for example water'. Perceptual knowledge comes into existence even at the first instant when the sense organ comes into contact with the object before it, whereas the inferential knowledge takes time. For instance, when a person infers the existence of fire on a mountain from the sight of the smoke, he has to go through a process. First, he sees the smoke

on the mountain; then he remembers the concomitance of smoke and fire he has seen in the kitchen; and then only he arrives at the conclusion that there is fire on the mountain. Therefore, perceptual knowledge, being earlier, is considered stronger than the inferential knowledge which is based on the perceptual knowledge elsewhere. Similar is the case in regard to Independent Scriptural Text, indicatory sign etc., where the former is stronger than the latter ("Independent Scriptural Texts, indicatory marks, sentences or short passages), names (or derivative words) where these are all applicable (but tending to different results), one is superior to the other in order, because the significance of each succeeding thing is more remote. (Purva Mimamsa (3-3-14). Self sufficient scriptural texts are the strongest in determining the meaning. Next to them are the lingas or indicatory marks and so on. Therefore, the conclusion in a passage which is weaker in the section must be so interpreted as to be in harmony with the beginning. So the word 'Riks' etc. meaning Verse (in metrical form) etc. occurring in the conclusion which is weaker in nature must be given only the secondary sense, viz the Veda – Rik means Rig Veda. Yajur means Yajur Veda and Sama means Sama Veda. Therefore, the conclusion is arrived at that the high pitch and the like are only the qualities of the Vedas, and not of the Mantras. Consequently, the Mantra "Than Him who is greater" does not postulate the superiority of deity other than Parama Purusha (i.e. Narayana) since that will be inconsistent with the trend at the beginning of the section.

It was stated in the prima facie view – a generic term is found to have a restricted connotation when it is used in close proximity to a specific term, as for example "Bring the cattle and the ox". Here the first term cattle is generic and it includes 'ox' also. But, because of the use of the word 'ox' also next to it, the scope of the word cattle is here restricted so as to apply to all cattle except the one ox mentioned. Similarly, here also, by the Mantra "Than Him who is greater" someone other than the Parama Purusha is declared to be superior. The texts – "There is

no other way” and “Than whom nothing else is greater” – seem to negate the existence of superiority of all persons in general. This negation can aptly be restricted to all person except the Paramapurusha with the result that some one does exist superior to the Parama-purusha. It is not so, we say. Go-balivarda Nyaya (the maxim of cattle – ox – maxim) cannot come into operation here. That principle is applicable only in those cases where two words are used in the same context. The meaning of one word is restricted so as to avoid the contingency of the use of the other word becoming vain. But, in the context here, by giving the full significance without restriction of the two Mantras “There is no other way”, and “Than who nothing else is greater”, no contingency will arise here of the Mantra “Than Him who is greater” becoming purposeless. For, it can as well be taken as an argument in support of the statement made before. Thus, this Mantra too has a meaning and becomes purposeful.

Moreover, after saying “Therefore Siva has pervaded all” the Text proceeds – The Mahapurusha is indeed the Lord and He is the bestower of the quality of Sattva”. By this, it is revealed that the Mahapurusha is the Deity who is the bestower of the quality of Sattva which alone is conducive to the attainment of Salvation. The word “Mahapurusha” used here reminds us of the Mahapurusha who has mentioned earlier in the Mantra – “Know do I this Mahapurusha,” and that both are identical. Likewise it is heard in the Maitreyopanishad, the bestowing of the quality of Satva is mentioned as the extraordinary quality of Vishnu (i.e. Narayana) “Then that, indeed, which is the Rajasa aspect that same is (Brahman and that which is) Brahma. “Then that, indeed, which is His Sattvika aspect, that same is (Brahman and that which is) Vishnu. And then that indeed, which is His Tamasa aspect, that same (is Brahman and that which) is Rudra”. Here also the previous Mantra reads: He has the faces, heads and necks of all; He dwells in the cavity (i.e. heart) of all beings. He is also Bhagavan (the Lord) who is immanent in all”. It is well-known from the Purusha Sukta and Narayana Anuvaka that the

quality of being the possessor of the faces, heads and necks of all is the extraordinary quality of Parama purusha and that is associated here with reference to Siva. So, it is proved that the Siva mentioned here is Narayana Himself. And, therefore, the conclusion is that in this Section Paramapurusha (i.e. Narayana) alone is dealt with. Consequently, the word Siva in "Therefore Siva is immanent in all" signifies only Narayana, as being endowed with the quality of purity and the like. It is also seen that here also (in the Narayana Anuvaka) the word 'Siva' is used with reference to Narayana alone in "Narayana, who is eternal, Siva and Achyuta".

Again, it was stated (in the prima facie view)— In the Dahara -Vidya in the Chandogya Upanishad – "Now, in that small lotus – like home (i.e. the heart) which is in this city of the Brahman". (Brahmapura, the body) by this Mantra Paramapurusha is mentioned by the word Akasa characterised as the bestower of name and form, and some other Reality (Tattva) that dwells within it is spoken of as the object of worship. This is only a statement made out of reverence for the Vedas by these not learned in them. For, the doubt is cleared by the Vedic Text itself by first raising a question and then answering it. To explain – here is the Mntra "Inside of it, there is the little ether (or dahara-Akasa); and what exists within that, that has to be sought after, that has, indeed, to be specially desired and known." (8-1-1). Here, the question is raised – "What is there that has to be sought after and that has, indeed, to be specially desired and known?" By way of answering it, the Upanishad says:- "As great indeed, as this Akasa ether is so great is the Akasa inside the heart. Both the Sky and the Earth are contained in it inside itself, both the fire and the air, both the sun and the moon; lightning and the stars whatever is here and whatever is not, all that is contained in it..... By the old age of this, this does not become sensile; nor is it killed by the death of this. This is Satya (the unchanging) Brahma-pura (Brahma the city)." By all these, it is taught that the Dahara-akasa (subtle Ether) under discussion has the qualities of being immense and being the supporter of all. Then by the mantra "In it are

contained Kamas (i.e. desirable qualities)” the answer is given that what was contained in it and was to be worshipped was the ‘Kamas’ (desires, i.e. desirable qualities). When the question arises – “What is this Dahara Akasa (subtle ether) and what are the Kamas (or desires) that are contained in it? The answer is given clearly that He who is mentioned by the word Dahara – Akasa is Paramatma (the Supreme Being), and the Kamas (desires) contained in it are the desirable qualities beginning with being devoid of sin and ending with the ability to will the truth. (Here the qualities are called ‘Kamas’ since they are worthy of being desired).

The Mantra that states – “This self is devoid of sin, free from old age, free from death, free from sorrow, free from hunger, and free from thirst, desires the truth and wills the truth.” (8-1-5) Then, it shows by another Mantra that those who meditate on the Paramatma endowed with the eight qualities of freedom from sin etc. attain Salvation implied here by the word ‘Satya-sankalpa’ (i.e. power of willing the truth). And the Mantra reads – “Now, to those who depart from here, after having known the Self (and also His eternal auspicious qualities). For there is free movement in all the worlds”. All this has been started clearly by the Vakyakara in the passage beginning with – The scriptural expression ‘what exists within that’ (8-1-1) refers to desires.

If so, how can you justify the meditation on that alone which is within the Dahara Akasa Subtle (Ether) mentioned at the beginning by the words “What exists within that, that has to be sought after”? We reply – Here the injunction is not in regard to the meditation on that alone which exists within it, but it is with reference to two things (the Brahman and its qualities); because towards the end, the meditation is said to be on two things as the following Text states – “Now to those who depart from here after having known the Self and also His eternal auspicious qualities. “But what is the word here which shows two things? We say (in reply) the word ‘That’ in the sentence ‘That has to be sought after’.

Again, the question is put – the relative pronoun ‘yat’ (i.e. which) in ‘That which is inside it’ refers to only one thing that is inside it and the word ‘Tat’ (i.e. that) which should be taken as its antecedent can indicate only that one thing. How then can it be said that the word ‘Tat’ (that) refers to two things? The reply is – The word ‘yat’ (that which) in “That which is inside it” is this – The Dahra – akasa which is in the centre of the lotus – like heart and also the group of qualities that are within it.

Again, it may be asked – how can two things be referred to by the word ‘yat’ (that which) this being a word in the singular number? How can the word be put in the singular number when it refers to two things of different genders? These questions are answered by Bhagavan Panini himself – Panini the author of the Sutras on Sanskrit Grammar by two Sutras – “The pronouns Tyat (He) and the like and always compounded with all words”. “A word in the Neuter gender can be compounded with another word in the non-neuter gender (i.e. masculine or feminine) and the compound will be in the neuter gender and may be in the singular, dual or plural number, “Panini says that when Tyat and other words are compounded with pronouns, only one of them always remains (others being dropped), and that when two words in the neuter gender are compounded, only one word in the neuter gender remains and that may be either in the singular number or other numbers. The word ‘which’ that is used with reference to the qualities that are in the Parama-purusha is in the singular number. That is due to the qualities being taken collectively as a class or genus. The singular number is not due to the quality being one only since the qualities are declared to be many by the Text itself which says “Desirable qualities in Him” (using the plural number to denote them).

It is again objected – The word in the opening part is in the singular number and so the plural number in “Desirable qualities in Him” may be so interpreted as to be in harmony with the singular number as is done in the case of “May Aditi untie the ropes”. (The word “paasaan”) (i.e. ropes) in the Mantra is in the

plural number. Since it has been laid down earlier that the animal that is going to be offered in the sacrifices is to be tied only with one rope, the plural occurring here is to be taken as denoting only the singular (i.e. one rope).

Not so, we reply. For, the singular number of the word 'yat' (which) in "That which is inside it" denotes the substance about which something is predicated, and the plural in "The desirable qualities" denotes the thing that is predicated.

The decision has been arrived at (and accepted by all) in the section on Grahaikatva (Adhikarana in Purva Mimamsa) that the gender and number of the word that denotes that is predicated is of greater significance and validity than the gender and number of the word that connotes that substance about which predication is made. Therefore, the former alone is to be accepted in preference to the latter.

It should not be doubted that the injunction with reference to the meditation on the qualities alone coming at the beginning is of greater validity and that in accordance with it the injunction with regard to meditation on the Person endowed with those qualities coming at the end should not be taken as effective and must be abandoned. For the conclusion, we arrive at, is that the guni (Person endowed with the qualities – i.e. the Person as well as the qualities) is to be meditated upon and that does not sublate the meditation on the qualities which is laid down at the opening (of the section). (This conclusion is not inconsistent with that of the Upakrama – adhikarana i.e. the topic about the validity of the beginning of a section). For what was stated in that Adhikarana is that what is proposed by the beginning of the passage should not be negated by the conclusion. (That does not prevent the addition of something more to it.) Therefore, the decision arrived at finally is this: since the passage here enjoins the worship of the Paramapurusha endowed with the eight qualities of freedom from sin etc., there is no question of the meditation on anybody else (excepting that Parama-purusha i.e. Narayana).

It was also stated in the prima facie view – in the Dahara

Vidya in the Taittiriya Upanishad, the Hymn – “Dahram Vipapmam” – (The subtle thing free from sin) declares that some Reality which is inside the Paramapurusha is to be meditated upon’ and then to the question who that Entity is, the answer is given by the following text in regard to particular deity – “He who is superior is Mahesvara i.e. Siva).” That too is not right. For on the principle of Sarva Vedanta Pratyaya (i.e. all Upanishadic Texts should be interpreted as to show that they impart a knowledge of something which is in agreement and that there is no mutual contradiction amongst them). This sentence in the Dahara-Vidya of Taittiriya Upanishad conveys the same import as that in the Dahara Vidya of Chandogya Upanishad. The conclusion that has been arrived at in regard to the latter is that the subject matter dealt with there is the Paramapurusha endowed with the eight qualities beginning with freedom from sin etc. Therefore, it is determined that this Dahara Vidya Taittiriya Upanishad also enjoins the meditation on the Paramapurusha associated with those eight-qualities. Consequently, the Mantra “He who is superior is Mahesvara” should be so interpreted as to be in agreement with that conclusion thus: He who is well-known as the object denoted by the letter ‘a’ which is the ultimate source of all the multitudinous words is repeated here by the relative pronoun ‘yah’ (who) and it is predicated that He is the Mahesvara. It is well-known that it is Vishnu who is denoted by the letter ‘a’ by texts like the following: “The letter ‘a’ denotes Vishnu”. It is also known that the letter ‘a’ is the source from which all the multitudinous words spring by the text – “The letter ‘a’ is indeed all words”. Again by the Vedic Text” (The letter) ‘a’ is Brahman” It is learnt that the Brahman is the object of connotation of the letter ‘a’. And by the Narayana Anuvaka and other texts which are exclusively devoted to the treatment of the Cause, it is determined that Narayana alone is the Supreme Brahman. Therefore, it is determined that the object of denotation of the letter ‘a’ is only Narayana. Therefore, it is concluded that Narayana, who is well-known as the object of denotation by the letter ‘a’ is signified here by the word

‘Mahesvara’. Moreover, it is declared in the Narayana Anuvaka that Narayana alone is the ‘Sarvesvara’ (Lord of all) and that Brahma and Siva are but part of His domain.

Again, it is stated – In the Brihadaranyaka (6-4-22) is the Mantra – “That which is the ether inside the heart, in it He sleeps; He is the controller of all, the ruler of all”. Here by the word Akasa (ether) the Lord (Narayana) is denoted and by the word ‘Isana’ Rudra is signified as being within Him. This view also is not correct, since the word ‘Akasa’ does not denote the paramapurusha (i.e. Narayana). We are able to know that Paramapurusha is not signified here by the word Akasa, because that word is well-known to signify usually the elemental ether. Therefore, that alone comes to our mind at first. Again, Akasa is not endowed with any of those qualities that belong exclusively to Paramatma. If any such quality were mentioned as existing in the Akasa, then it will have to be treated as a case of exception and Akasa must be said to denote Paramapurusha. The existence within the heart is possible even in the case of the word ‘Sushira’ (i.e. cavity) – in the passage ‘Within it (i.e. the heart) there is a subtle cavity’ – circumscribed by the interior of the heart. On the other hand, it can be determined that the word Akasa (Ether) refers to Paramapurusha in the Chandogya Upanishad Mantra – “Within it is the Subtle Akasa (Ether) and that which it” – since there is the association of the qualities of the Paramapurusha in the Akasa. But, here, it is stated that He who is lying in the Akasa (and not Akasa) has the qualities of having all under control and the like. Therefore, it is determined that He alone is the Paramapurusha and not that which is mentioned by words as His support. “There too (in the heart) what is subtle, (like) space (immeasurable) and free from sorrow (and all other imperfections) – (namely, the Brahman) – and what is inside Him, that has to be worshipped” (10-23). With reference to the word ‘Gagana’ (i.e. Akasa or Ether) in this Mantra also freedom from sin and freedom from sorrow are predicated. Therefore ‘Gagana’ (Akasa) here also signifies Paramapurusha, with the result that in this passage also,

there is no reference to the worship of a god other than the Paramapurusha (i.e. Narayana).

It was again stated in the *prima facie* view – There is the Hymn in Atharva-sikhopanishad; “What is to be meditated upon is the ultimate cause. Only Sambhu, who is possessed of all supreme powers and who is the lord of all, is fit to be meditated upon in the midst of the sky.” By this, is enjoined the worship of Rudra who is the same as Sambhu, and who exists within the Paramapurusha who is also known by the name of Akasa (ether). This view also is incorrect, because, in the manner stated above, the word ‘Akasa’ here denotes only the ether of the heart and does not signify the Paramapurusha; because the qualities of being the cause and the like which exclusively belong to the Lord (i.e. Paramapurusha) are found predicated only with reference to Him who is within it; because the words ‘Sambhu’ and Siva’ are seen to be used, both in the Veda and in the world, to signify things other than Rudra; and because they are found used with reference to Narayana also in the following Text – “Whose eyes see everything, who brings about good to the Universe, who is eternal, who is Siva and Achyuta” (11-15), Therefore, it is understood from this passage that Narayana alone is to be meditated upon.

Moreover, this passage begins with the questions, “who is to be meditated upon,” and gives the answer “What is to be meditated upon is the ultimate cause,” From this, it can be understood that some object is restated here as being the cause and it is enjoined that it must be meditated upon. A re-statement always implies that there is mention about that earlier in some place. Mahopanishad and the like supply that need and determine that Narayana alone is the cause. From all this, it is determined that it is enjoined here that Narayana alone must be meditated upon. It is for this reason again that the Isana who has been mentioned here as the object to be meditated upon by the Mantra “Meditate upon Isana” is only Narayana who is well-known in the Texts like “He is the Lord of the Universe”.

It was said (by the objector) that Vishnu also is placed in the midst of the created beings on the authority of the Text: – “Brahma, Vishnu, Rudra and Indra – all of them are generated (created), the reply is – it must be understood that this statement is in regard to the incarnation of Narayana as Vishnu placing Himself between Brahma and Rudra even as He takes this birth as the brother of Indra (i.e. Upendra), Sri Rama and Sri Krishna. The reasons for this are:

1. As established already, this sentence has for its purpose the laying down of the injunction in regard to meditation and it only restates, by the word, “are generated”, something well-known already from other texts.

2. It is well-known from other Vedic Texts that Brahma and others have got a birth which shows that they are beings who are created in accordance with their respective actions (good and bad).

3. it is known with reference to the Lord (i.e. Narayana) that His birth is only an incarnation due to His own will and that too for the sake of the protection of the Universe as the following Text states – “Not being born He is born with divers forms”. It must be understood therefore that the birth of the Lord is not due to Karma as is the case with others, but due to His own free will. This is supported by the following verse of the Fifth Veda (i.e. Mahabharata) – “For the protection of all beings He assumed the form of Vishnu.” The mention of Vishnu in this sentence which lays down the injunction in regard to the object of worship is only to show His easy accessibility which is conducive to His being the object of meditation.

It was contended that in the passage “Brahman is Truth, knowledge and Infinite”, the Lord is mentioned by the word ‘Parama-vyoma’ (i.e. great Akasa) and Brahman who is to be meditated upon is stated to be the substance that has Him as the substratum. That is also not correct. Here also, it is declared that Brahman alone is the object of worship and that alone is to be meditated upon since the qualities that are exclusively the Lord’s

are associated only with the Brahman and not with the Parama-vyoma (great ether) which is its support-qualities like being the cause of the Universe, being the Inner Soul of the Universe and existing within the orb of the Sun—qualities described in the following Texts: “From that same Self, indeed, the spatial ether came into existence” (2.1.1).” Different from this which consists of understanding (or knowledge) is the (still) Inner Self, the Anandamaya (or that which consists of Bliss)” (2.5.1). “He who is in the Purusha and who is also in the Sun”. Therefore, the word ‘Parama Vyoma’ signifies the Divine World (i.e. Vaikuntha) which is well-known in other Vedic Texts like – “That (which exists) in the unchanging Parama Vyoma (great ether)”; That is the highest place of (of attainment) of Vishnu which the Suris (i.e. Eternal Angels) are ever seeing” “In that superior word of golden hue Brahman, which is Infinite, shines”.

But in the first Section of Atharva-siropanishad, it is proclaimed by Rudra that He is the Ruler of all. That it, is due to the fact of the immanence of the Paramatma inside him is clear from the Vedic Text itself which says – “He entered inside from within”. The words of Rudra there are – “He from within entered inside”. In this sentence it will be clearly understood that Paramatma is certainly some one other than Rudra and that Paramatma exists as the Inner Self of Rudra as well as of all others by the use of the word ‘sah’ – the pronoun of the Third person which denotes a person other than the speaker and also by the use of the verb ‘entered’ which is also in the third person.

It may be said – it appears that the speech of Rudra comes to an end with the word ‘iti’ (thus) in “No one is there other than myself” and there is no indication that there is the mention of a Paramatma apart from Rudra. Since no Paramatma is mentioned here, he cannot be referred to by the pronoun ‘sah’ (he) and only Rudra, whose name is in the passage, can be referred to by it. From this, it results that the sentence “He entered from within” is not spoken by Rudra, but it is only a statement of the Vedic Text. Therefore, in the context, it is stated

that Rudra is the Paramatma who has entered into all the Inner Self and not some one other than Rudra.

It should not be argued in this way. For, the further statements beginning with the words 'soham' (That I) are explanatory (of what was stated before) and so the speech of Rudra has not come to an end with that. Again the word 'iti' may have either of the two meanings ' because of ' or ' in this way ' (The latter meaning is taken here). So the sentence "He from within" is understood to be the words of Rudra which explain his previous statement. In the sentence, "I alone was there singly at first", the words are spoken by Rudra realising the fact that. He also has as His Inner Self the Paramatma who is the Inner Self of all. Since the Paramatma has been introduced in the statement of Rudra, the word 'sah' (he) may very well refer to Paramatma who is certainly different from (and other viz.) Rudra and who is the Inner Self of the latter (i.e. Rudra), and has entered into him. Therefore, it is decided that Narayana is other than Rudra and is his Inner Self. And in the words of Rudra, Narayana alone is referred to by the word 'Aham' (I) since He is the Antaratma (or the Inner Self).

Even granting that the words " He from within" are the words of the Veda (and not of Rudra), they have to be interpreted in such a way as to be in agreement with the numerous Vedic Texts which undoubtedly and exclusively speak (of Narayana as Paramatma). In that case, it is possible to take the word 'entered' as having the sense of 'entered by thought' (i.e. intellectual entry is intended and not physical entry). Such usages are found in literature also e.g. "Whatever may be the state of a man, with that same state of nature he enters, a man of intellect as he is, and brings it (i.e. the body), under his control at once." In the same way, it can be established in the case of this passage also that it states Rudra by means of his meditation entered into the Lord who is the Inner Self of all (i.e. realised Him as being the Inner Self of himself also). Therefore, in this passage Rudra, by the word 'I' refers only to his own Inner Self, Narayana.

Such is the trend in the Pratardana Vidya in the Kaushitaki Brahamana – “Pratardana, the son of Divodasa, went to the pleasing mansion of Indra” There Pratardana asks Indra about the means of Salvation in the following words – “Pray, you yourself choose for me a boon that you consider to be the most beneficial to man”. Indra says in reply – “Worship me alone. Indeed I am the Prana and the omniscient Self. Worship and meditate on me as life, as immortality”. (3-1). By this Indra teaches him that the means of Salvation is meditation on the Paramatma who is his Inner Self.

Similar is the teaching in another Veda – “After seeing this (Brahman), the sage Vamadeva experiences – I have become Manu and also the Sun.” I am the seer Kakshivan, O Brahmin” (Br. 1.4. 10 R.V. 426.1) Vamadeva gives out what he has realised by means of deep meditation – (viz. Paramatma is the Inner Self of all and that Paramatma is the utmost limit to which the denotation of words extends), Therefore, Vamadeva refers in his speech by the word ‘I’ to the Paramatma who is his Inner Self and also refers to Manu. Sun and others in grammatical co-ordination with himself (as I have become Manu and Sun). All this is well-known from the following Texts – “He whose body is the individual self” ... He is the Internal Self of all beings. He is free from all sins. He is the Divine lord, the only Narayana (Subala Upanishad-7). Beginning with the words “It thought – May I become manifold and be born” Chandogya Upanishad says – “Entering (the three deities) along with this individual Self which is (also) the same as Myself, I evolve the differentiations of name and form” (6.3.2). Taittiriya Upanishad begins “He desired, May I become manifold” and continues – “Having entered into it He became the Sat and the Tyat (the existent and the non-existent)” (2.6.1). So says Prahlada – “Since Ananta (Narayana) pervades everything, I am he; from me (arises) all; I am all; all things are in me who are eternal”. (Vishnu Puranam (1.19.85). All this has been determined by the author of the (Brahma) Sutras (Badarayana) himself in the section with the Sutra – “And the

teaching in the context is, as in the case of Vamadeva, in accordance with the view in the Scripture.” (1-1-31).

In the Mahabharata also, it is stated that Vishnu is the Inner Self of Rudra by the following verse – “Vishnu was the Soul of the Lord Rudra possessed of unlimited valour. Because of this, He (Mahesvara) was able to withstand the touch of the bowstring.” There again in the conversation between Brahma Rudra, Brahma says to Rudra – “He is the Inner Self of you, of myself, and of all who are called embodied beings. He is the witness, having a direct vision of all. But he cannot be comprehended by any one anywhere.” (Santi Parva 361.4).

There again, after mentioning Brahma and Rudra, it is stated – “These two, who are the greatest among the gods, are considered to have been born (respectively) out of His (Bhagavan’s goodwill and wrath; and they perform the duties of creation and destruction in accordance with the way shown by Him.” (Santiparva 350-19).

In the second Section again is found the following statement of the gods – “He who is Rudra, is, indeed, the Bhagavan (i.e. Lord)”. As they are also the words of Rudra, they must be explained so as to be in harmony with other words of his and to express identical sentiments. As it has been determined already that the words of Rudra are spoken by him after having realised that the Paramatma is his Inner Self and as that is also in accordance with the teachings of many Vedic Texts speaking in one voice, it is concluded that those words of Rudra propound that Rudra is not the Supreme Lord of all.

Further, in the third and fourth sections of the Upanishad, several names of Rudra are mentioned and etymological explanations of those names are also given. It may be contended that the Lordship of Rudra is being stated there. That too is not correct, since those two Section are devoted to the idea of interpreting etymologically the Pranava mantra and of the names of Rudra after making a mention of all of them beginning from the letter Om (Om-kara) and ending with the word Mahadeva. The

Mantras begin – “That is Omkara which is Omkara; that is Pranava which is Pranava.” Therefore, there is no question of their having any connection with Rudra, the well-known deity. Even if the words Rudra and others are taken as to signify the Paramatma, who is denoted by the Pranavamanttra, that Paramatma, as has been established before, is only the Lord Narayana, (and not Rudra) : Even in this sentence, those words are used in grammatical co-ordination with the word Bhagavan (which signifies Narayana). For these reasons, it is proper to hold that the Pranava and other names in the passage in question signify only the Lord, Narayana.

Again in the fifth Section, there is an injunction in regard to the performance of meditation on Rudra as the means for Salvation. It is determined on the basis of the principle enunciated above that meditation also is in regard to the Paramatma (the Supreme Soul) who is the Inner Self of Rudra. This is in accordance with the decision arrived at with reference to the Madhu-vidya (in the Brahma Sutra) – “In regard to the forms of worship in which the object of worship is conceived to be the qualification (of the gods etc., to be worshippers) because such a thing is impossible.” (1.3.30). The Madhuvidya in the Chandogya Upanishad begins – “This Sun is, indeed, the honey of the gods.” Then, it enjoins the meditation on gods like the Vasus as the means for Salvation. But, this injunction about the meditation on gods like the Vasus is really that with regard to the meditation on the Paramatma who is their Inner Self, it has been so established in the adhikarana of Brahmasutra “Madhwadishpwaslambavat”.

The smearing of the holy ashes is enjoined here as an auxiliary to meditation. That must not be taken as an auxiliary to all the various meditations in general, but must be restricted to that particular Vidya or meditation. Such a decision is like that arrived at in regard to the use of the liquor-bowl enjoined as an auxiliary to a Sacrifice, Sanutramani by name. There, the use of the liquor-bowl is restricted only to that particular sacrifice (i.e. Sanutramani), and there is no occasion for the liquor-bowl being taken as

auxiliary to all the sacrifices in general.

Here again, an objection is raised – In the passage beginning with “He who is more subtle than the (subtle) atom”, The Vedic Text reads – “He, who is the foremost of the gods and also in the forefront; He, who is greater than all, is Rudra the great Seer; He, who sees Hiranyagarbha (i.e. Brahma) as he (the latter) is taking birth; That god (i.e. Rudra) unites us with doubtful memory (or knowledge). “From this passage, it appears that Rudra is the cause of all (beings) since he is declared to be existing even before the birth of Hiranyagarbha (i.e. the four-faced Brahma). Not so, we say, since the existence of Rudra even before the birth of Hiranyagarbha is not stated here; but, what is said is that he was seeing the birth of Hiranyagarbha (Brahma). By this, it does not become an established fact that Rudra existed before the birth of Brahmas. This is what the Hymn purports to say – “(Rudra) He, who is greater than all, is Rudra, the great Seer” – By means of yogic power, Rudra is able to have a direct vision of all things existing in all the three periods of time – past, present and future – and so it is learnt he is superior to all the yogins. Therefore, even though his birth is posterior to that of Hiranyagarbha, it is possible for him to have a vision of the birth of Hiranyagarbha. That the birth of Rudra takes place only after that of Hiranyagarbha (i.e. Brahma) is very well-known from the hymns of Mathopaniṣad and the like. As for the Hymn that “That god unites us with auspicious memory,” it is only a statement of the fact that the seekers after Release desire the favour of Rudra for getting spiritual knowledge since it is conducive to the meditation on the Lord (i.e. Narayana). To that effect are the words of Rudra in the dialogue between Parvati and Mahesvara in Mahabharata – “O Brahmins; Hari is always to be adored and I am the means for enabling you to remember Hari.” (Hari vamsa 132-8). Here, he unites us with the memory of Bhagavan (i.e. Narayana). Or in the Mantra “He who is the foremost among the gods, “by the word ‘who’ there is a re-statement of a fact which is well-known in other Vedas, namely that Narayana is the cause

of Hiranyagarbha. So, it is determined that the Mantra here refers to only Narayana (as the foremost among the gods). Here Rudra term, like Akasa Prana by their correct meaning and not being the alternate by themselves refer to Narayana only.

The purpose of Sri Rudra Text is not the teaching of the lordship of Rudra over all, since qualities of being the cause of the Universe, the grantor of Salvation and so on which are exclusively those of Sarvesvara (i.e. Narayana) are not found there, since its use is seen to be for a different purpose in Agnichayana (the kindling of fire), and since it is inconsistent with numerous other Vedic passages mentioned already as being exclusively devoted (to the teaching of the lordship of Narayana).

For the very same reason, the hymns of Ati Rudra and Pancha Brahma passages are not intended to describe the greatness of Rudra. Statements like "Rudra, indeed, is all" are to be viewed in the same manner as "the brahmin is, indeed, all gods," and "Waters, indeed, are all this." The interpretation of the passage here is thus - Brahmadipatih - means the master of Brahma, i.e. the propounder of the Vedas; in that way he is the helper of Brahman. Siva, who is conducive to the knowledge of Brahman, may and that Siva be always with me. In line with the principles states above, Texts like "One Rudra alone was there; and there was no second" should be interpreted.

Here is an objection as follows: - "Then he, indeed, who really is the Rajasa part of this (Rudra)" - By this hymn in the Maitrayani Upanishad, it appears to be declared that the Trimurtis (i.e. three fold forms -Brahma, Vishnu and Siva) are only limbs of a supreme being and therefore other than the Paramatma (i.e. Narayana) (and superior to Him). It is not so - In the manner stated above, it has been indisputably determined Vishnu alone is the Paramatma and the relative pronoun 'yah' (who) used with reference to Him signifies only Him incarnation. Vishnu is the whole entity and Brahma and all other beings are but a limb of His. His incarnation is quite different from the birth of other beings and Brahma. Or in regard to the birth of Vishnu, the word 'birth'

may be taken in a secondary sense (i.e. manifesting Himself).

By this method of interpretation, other similar passages can be taken to have been explained - passages like "O Brahmin: Brahma, Vishnu and Siva are important powers of the Brahman." It should not be doubted that because of passages like "He is Brahma, He is Siva" which speak of non-difference, the essential nature of Narayana and those of Brahma and others are identical; because the difference between them has been clearly stated - the difference that Narayana is the creator and the others are created beings, and that He is the object of worship and they are the worshippers. If identity between them, is expressed anywhere, it is due to the fact that Narayana is their Inner Soul and they are His bodies. This has been already explained by us. Other Vedic Texts also should be interpreted on the principle shown above.

Thus, the conclusion arrived at is that the Para Brahman which is said to be superior to all other beings in all the Vedas and Vedanta (Upanishads) is only Narayana and not Brahma, Rudra or any other God.

Thus, it is known from the Vedic Texts which are current that Narayana alone is the Superior Reality. Therefore, only those Puranas and others, will have to be accepted as Explanatory Treatises of the Vedas which are in consonance with the Vedic teachings. The Puranas and other works which are the words of human beings and which attain the status of a valid authority only because of their being in accordance with the Vedas.

Moreover, in Purusha Nirnaya (a work of Sri Yamuna or Alavandar) and Vedartha Sangraha of Ramanuja it has been very clearly established that only those Puranas are authoritative whose origin can be traced to the quality of Sattva (in their authors). Other words, whose origin is traced to the qualities of Rajas and Tamas (in their authors), are not authoritative.

Therefore, it is the firmly established conclusion that Narayana alone is the Superior Brahman about whom enquiry is to be made by those who are desirous of Release (or Salvation).

SANSKRIT VERSE

This work TATTVA-NIRNAYA [which is in agreement with the Vedas] has been composed by VARDHA, a scion of the Vatsya Clan, [the object of delectation to the eyes (i.e. the son) of Sri Devaraja.]

THUS ENDS TATTVA-NIRNAYA

COMPOSED BY

SRI VARDARYA (NADADUR AMMAL)

The grand son of the nephew of Ramanuja well versed in Vedanta, the gem of the vatsya clan.